DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 139 756 95 SP 011 053

AUTHOR	Hagberg, Hilma; And Others
TITLE	The Work-Study Team: A Model for Collaboration Between School and University. Occasional Paper No. 19.
INSTITUTION	Stanford Univ., Calif. School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Teacher Corps.
PUB DATE	May 77
GRANT	G007502009
NOTE	21p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Problems; *College School Cooperation; Inservice Teacher Education; Instructional Improvement; Interpersonal Problems; Junior High Schools; *Pilot Projects; *Program Evaluation; *Research and Instruction Units; *Success Factors
IDENTIFIERS	San Jose Unified School District; Stanford University

ABSTRACT

The work-study team concept has evolved from a Teacher Corps grant to Stanford School of Education and Herbert Hoover Junior High School, San Jose, California, and represents the basic vehicle of the project for collaboration between the university and school in providing more effective inservice education, school improvement, and field-based research. Eight work-study teams were organized: four concerned with the subject areas of mathematics, language arts, social studies, and physical education; four "innovation teams" dealt with multicultural education, bilingual education, teaching in open space, and community involvement. Four of the teams were relatively successful, two remained functioning through the year, and two effectively disbanded before the end of the year for lack of support or interest. Two of the more serious difficulties were goal definition, and trust and leadership. Positive experience suggested that collaboration is possible if: (1) decisions affecting the school community are made by the school-staff team members; (2) time is invested in developing good team relations; (3) team members are willing to assume new roles; and (4) concrete, immediate problems provide the initial focus for collaboration. Limitations of the concept involve (1) the length of time needed to develop trust and credibility, (2) individual differences in team member capacities for dealing with competing goals, (3) the capability for stimulating unperceived staff development needs, and (4) practical limitations involving participant involvement, incentives, physical distances, scheduling etc. Guidelines for determining the need for and organizing effective teams and for ensuring their continuing effectiveness have been appended. (MB)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED139756

Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching
School of Education, Stanford University
Stanford, California

Occasional Paper No. 19

THE WORK-STUDY TEAM: A MODEL FOR COLLABORATION BETWEEN SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY

Hilma Hagberg, Patricia Fitzgerald,
Barbara McFarren, Robert Nolan, Barbara Pence,
Susan Roper, Clara Schneider, Decker Walker

May 1977

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Published by the Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, supported in part as a research and development center by funds from the National Institute of Education and the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the National Institute of Education or the Office of Education. (Contract No. OEG-G0075 02009.)

SP011 055

Introductory Statement

The mission of the Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching is to improve teaching in American schools. Current major operations include three research and development programs--Teaching Effectiveness, The Environment for Teaching, and Teaching and Linguistic Pluralism--and two programs combining research and technical assistance, the Stanford Urban/Rural Leadership Training Institute and the Hoover/Stanford Teacher Corps Project. A program of exploratory and related studies provides for smaller studies that are not part of the major programs.

This paper describes part of the work of the Hoover/Stanford Teacher Corps Project.

Acknowledgments

We wish to express our thanks to the teachers, administrators, and staff of Herbert Hoover Junior High School, San Jose, California. and to the faculty and staff of the Stanford School of Education. The enthusiasm and hard work of both were necessary to begin and to sustain the work-study teams. We are also grateful for the support of the National Teacher Corps which enabled us to develop and implement the work-study team concept.

THE WORK-STUDY TEAM: A MODEL FOR COLLABORATION BETWEEN SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY

Hilma Hagberg, Patricia Fitzgerald, Barbara McFarren,
Robert Nolan, Barbara Pence, Susan Roper,
Clara Schneider, Decker Walker

The school and university have common interests in school improvement, in-service education, and field-based research. That both institutions direct their work toward school improvement is shown by the continuing efforts within the schools to develop and put into practice curricular revisions, and innovative methods and materials, and by the university's efforts to expand educational theory and technical knowledge. In-service education for practicing teachers is offered by the schools through workshops, demonstrations, and specialists' services, and by the university through courses, credential programs, and advanced degree programs. Both institutions have attempted to develop field or classroom-based research that will directly benefit students and teachers.

But though both institutions have shared these interests, they have tended to pursue them independently, frequently duplicating each other's efforts. There has been little productive collaboration. A possible explanation for the lack of collaborative school-university efforts, despite this commonality of interests and goals, may be the remarkable lack of models for such collaboration. Until recently, shared activities have consisted chiefly of student-teaching arrangements, experimental studies, and consultant services. Such "models" might be termed quasi-collaborative, since they seldom serve the needs and interests of the school and the university equally. The representatives and interests of one or the other institution frequently dominate and determine the goals, the direction, and the quality of the joint project.

Furthermore, members of one or both groups often do not respect the concerns and skills of the other. University consultants and

in-service training programs prepared and conducted by university people may be perceived as--and often are--irrelevant to teachers' immediate classroom needs. Teachers see university programs as operating from a distant, safe world of researchers and theorists who disclaim public school life or--even worse--have never worked in the public schools. By the same token, university people often assume that public school staffs are not interested in the new information derived from research and are content to operate on the basis of the training and predispositions acquired many years earlier. They criticize school programs for responding to immediate day-to-day pressures and lacking a long-range perspective based on sound educational theory.

Though these descriptions are stereotypical, there clearly is a need to decrease the distance between the two institutions, to encourage the exchange of information and experience between public school and university, and, most important, to increase the effectiveness of both institutions in improving public school education. This report describes the efforts of one school and one university to develop and implement a model for collaboration.

A two-year grant from the National Teacher Corps has enabled the staffs of a California junior high school and the Stanford School of Education to undertake a joint project consisting of (1) the preservice training of four intern teachers, and (2) the development of a school-university collaborative model having as its goals school improvement, the development of more effective means of in-service education, and the conduct of relevant field-based research.

Unique to the second component of the project is the work-study team, which was conceptualized and implemented as the basic vehicle for collaboration. After the first year of project operation (1975-76), it is possible to offer a description of the work-study team as a collaborative model--its structure, processes, and possible limitations.

The Structure and Operation of Work-Study Teams

The primary task of the work-study team is to develop and implement solutions to problems at a particular school. Teams may be oriented either to specific subject matter or to issues of concern to teachers of several subject areas.

During the first year of the project, eight work-study teams were organized: four directly concerned with the subject areas of mathematics, language arts, social studies, and physical education; four, termed "innovation teams," concerned with multicultural education, bilingual education, teaching in open space, and community involvement. The teams ranged in size from five to fifteen members; members were primarily teachers, instructional assistants, school administrators, intern teachers, professors, and graduate research assistants. Meetings were formally chaired by school staff members and, on the more smoothly functioning teams, meeting agendas were prepared and minutes were kept.

Team meetings were scheduled during school hours, from 2:00 to 3:30 one afternoon a week. Subject area and innovation teams met alternate weeks. School and university staff members typically participated in one subject area team and one innovation team. Each work-study team controlled its own budget of approximately $1600, and used the money in a variety of ways: for ERIC searches, consultant services, and curricular materials development.

A Model Team

One of the most successful work-study teams dealt with moving into and teaching and learning in an open-space school. The school was scheduled to move in the spring of the project year from its old quarters (consisting of self-contained classrooms and temporary buildings) to a new open-space building in which English and social studies classes would be conducted in one central open section of the building and math teachers would share a common area for instruction. The operation of the Open-Space Work-Study Team in dealing with problems associated with this

move illustrates the main features of the work-study team as a form of school-university collaboration in solving school problems.

The Open-Space Team set about, first of all, to assess what faculty members anticipated would be key problems. The anticipated problems were organized into four categories: noise and discipline, student movement, use of the media center, and student and parent orientation to the open-space school. Limited time and staff made it essential that the work-study team develop agendas for action based on high priority needs.

The university faculty advisor and research assistant for the Open-Space Team compiled brief summaries of research on open-space schools and on the experiences of other teachers and administrators with teaching and managing classrooms in open space in each of the four areas of anticipated problems. They then visited and observed teachers currently working in open-space situations and identified those who could provide useful information about successful practices. Subsequently, the Open-Space Team reviewed the abstracts, selected from among the most promising consultants (who proved to be teachers currently working in open space), and, with the help of these practitioner-consultants, conducted in-service sessions for the entire school staff.

Research literature and consultants confirmed the teachers' concerns. What seemed to be critical for students and teachers in the initial stages in the open setting were, for example, the need for uniform attendance accounting and specific rules for student movement between teaching areas. The Open-Space Team decided that a limited but explicit set of rules and procedures for open space ought to be developed, agreed upon by the entire faculty, and supported by parents, students, and administrators. Parent and student input on the tentative rules was sought by means of parent workshops, a special open house, and presentations on open space in each social studies class. The tentative rules were then presented to the faculty; after considerable discussion and revision, a list of basic rules was accepted by the entire faculty. All of these steps were completed by late November of 1975.

Because the move into the new building was postponed until mid-May of 1976, when only four weeks of the school year remained, we could not rigorously evaluate either the degree or the effectiveness of the implementation of the rules. Most participants believe, however, that these organized and consistent policies helped to promote what was a rather smooth transition to the new building.

The Open-Space Work-Study Team's attempts to solve an immediate, significant problem illustrates the basic problem-solving approach envisioned in the concept of the work-study team. The teachers, the university personnel, and the entire school staff studied the available information and worked together to define and solve a pressing problem. Their work exemplifies seven key steps in problem solving: assessing needs, defining problems, setting priorities, reviewing related research and practitioners' experience in developing solutions, obtaining support from relevant groups, implementing likely solutions, and evaluating their effectiveness.*

Some Problems of Collaboration

The collaborative endeavor, during the first trial year, was in no way rigid or formulistic. Though the process may look neat and systematic from a distance, a great deal of improvisation, judgment, and creativity went into it. The interpersonal dynamics found in any problem-solving group were apparent in the work-study teams. More often than not the work-study teams did not consistently or peacefully progress through the above steps. The functioning of the teams in accomplishing their goals ranged from real success to total failure.

To be precise, in four teams members were generally satisfied, worked consistently, modified their instructional strategies, and produced tangible results. But even these teams had problems along the way. Goals proved less desirable than expected; the team's successes

*A more detailed account of the work of the Open-Space Team can be found in Roper and Nolan, "Down from the Ivory Tower: A Model of Collaborative In-Service Education," SCRDT Occasional Paper No. 16, Feb. 1977.

brought it into conflict with other teams; goals were attained earlier than expected, leaving the group with no further purpose.

Two of the remaining four teams held together through the year, though their members were dissatisfied and their attendance at meetings inconsistent; in the end, they produced little in the way of measurable or tangible products. The other two teams effectively disbanded before the end of the year for lack of support or interest, though not before planning and proposing new ways their agenda could be addressed next year by the surviving teams. Some of the problems of all four of these teams were hidden agenda displacing stated ones; trying to do too many things at once; little zeal; failure to agree on goals, agendas, and priorities; perfunctory participation; and even some sabotage of group efforts by dissident members.

The fact that four of the teams were relatively successful seems reason enough to continue our experiment with the work-study team as a model of collaboration. We learned much during the first project year, a year which was planned as a sort of shake-down to identify and work out the nature of the collaborative relationship. It has become apparent that collaboration is not easy but that problematic aspects of the process can be identified and--given sufficient time and determination--resolved. What follows is a brief rundown of two of the more serious difficulties a work-study team is likely to encounter.

Goals. A given of any group of people working together is that the goals being pursued range from broad program goals to the individual and personal goals of participants and that while certain objectives are formally stated and are ostensibly pursued, unstated and/or divergent goals may be receiving most attention. Our work-study teams were no exception; at least three sets of goals were being pursued: program, team, and personal. This variety of goals and objectives offered a good test of the resiliency of the collaborative model.

The work-study teams operated within the context of the goals of the project: i.e., bringing the skills and knowledge of public school and university staff to bear on school problems, carrying out field-based research, and encouraging and assisting in teachers' professional

development. Each work-study team developed a set of formal objectives related to these overall goals. A prime source of difficulty during the year was the frequently made assumption that all stated team objectives had equal, positive support from team members. For instance, one team objective was "to establish an operating pilot program in bilingual education." Though defined and approved by the team, this objective never reached fruition because of within-team differences of opinion about the importance of having a true bilingual program rather than a program that treated English as the dominant language. Team members did not have equal interest in establishing a bilingual program, and staff and central office support for the program was not as high for this project objective as for many others.

Differences of opinion developed between school and university personnel over the relative importance of objectives. Objectives of the English team were to "identify major categories of time expenditures in the teaching of English" and "suggest ways for making more effective use of this time." While team members generally agreed that these were valuable, teachers viewed an objective concerning the preparation of English classes for the move to open space as far more important. From the university staff's orientation, objectives directly concerned with the improvement of teaching and curriculum were far more important--and more interesting. Yet, for the teachers faced with handling the details of the move and classroom reorganization, the second objective was the more important.

The most difficult goals and objectives to assess and to deal with are what might be termed personal ones: obtain extra things for my classroom, find subjects for my research, dominate colleagues, finance graduate school, show professors what schools are really like, protect my school from being taken over by outsiders, improve my teaching strategies, solve individual students' problems, familiarize myself with recent scholarly research, improve my knowledge of life in the public schools, do research studies that are of direct benefit to real students. While

some issues involving goal conflicts can be decided by voting, rival goals will not necessarily disappear, nor will all participants support the voted-in goal. Thus an important aspect of collaboration is the awareness of diverse goals and of the need to mesh goals in positive, productive ways.

It is not always necessary or beneficial to resolve disagreement about goals, however. There is something to be said for non-destructive diversity; often it serves to motivate, vitalize interaction, and organize priorities more than can agreement on distant, formal goals. Furthermore, individuals' separate goals need not be exclusive. For example, wanting to conduct and write up a research project is not necessarily at odds with directly improving classroom instruction. The teacher whose main goal is to obtain team money for classroom materials can be shown that there is more to buying materials than money, that there are methods for evaluating the merits of materials in advance, and that he or she can learn to conduct a sound evaluation of such materials in the classroom.

Trust and leadership. A major part of working out goal conflicts lies not in changing the goals, but in developing the trust among team participants which will permit them to be forthright about their goals. Important to the development of an atmosphere which fosters such trust and openness in the collaborative relationship is careful attention to the way in which discussion is conducted and leadership is exercised.

Ideally, in discussions among team members everyone speaks and is listened to as an equal. It is best if problem areas are initially identified by school staff members and joint analysis of these areas is then conducted by school and university people. Often such analysis leads to a more specific statement of the nature of the problem and the identification of its many smaller discrete or contributing subproblems. This back-and-forth analytic process is one of the most useful aspects of team meetings. Ultimately, the decision to follow a particular course of action must rest with those working at the school site.

Ideally, too, leadership is not fixed but is determined primarily by the roles and likely contributions of participants. That is, school

staff members might be expected to take the lead in discussing the needs and achievement levels of their students, identifying programmatic deficiencies, judging the feasibility of new procedures or approaches in the classroom, and recognizing their own professional development needs. Similarly, university staff might be expected to take the lead in providing relevant research data about identified problems, formulating alternative approaches to solving problems, developing and providing training in systematic planning for implementation and evaluation of solutions.

During the first sessions of one of the work-study teams, a central office supervisor was in frequent attendance at meetings. He had the clear purpose of introducing a topic he felt worthy of the team's attention. The university people accepted his proposed project as a reasonable concern and began talking and planning. School staff members quietly and unenthusiastically accepted the project, but eventually went to the project director and school principal to object to his proposal. The matter was brought up for discussion again in team meetings and was soon dropped. This unfortunate experience, which cost a great deal in terms of time and positive human relations in the team, provided some early and excellent lessons in collaboration. There was clearly an over-eagerness on the part of university people to assume leadership, dominate the dialogue of the team, and too hurriedly seek commitment to action with a concomitant failure to seek out the true feelings and attitudes of the team members. In the face of such aggressiveness, and perhaps in fear of appearing uncooperative to a central office supervisor, some group members were unwilling to assert themselves in the team meeting.

Some Ground Rules

The year's positive experiences suggest that collaboration is possible, but that the following ground rules must be accepted by both parties:

1. Decisions affecting the school community must be made by the public school staff members of the work-study team.

2. Good team relations require adequate time to develop.
3. Work-study team members need to be willing to assume new roles.
4. Concrete, immediate school problems provide the best initial focus for collaboration.

First, public school staff members must make the decisions that will affect the school community. Unlike the school staff, university staff members are at the school site and involved with projects for a short time. They do not have a long-term personal or professional commitment to these specific students, parents, or each other. Furthermore, the school staff has a legal responsibility to fulfill certain state and local requirements concerning the education, health, and safety of children. Any projects proposed for the school must be evaluated, particularly by school administrators, not only for their short-term experimental value, but also for their long-term effects. Even the most worthwhile-appearing project or decision within the work-study team must be evaluated not only in terms of its goodness or soundness, but in terms of its impact on school faculty and community relations. It is imperative that the university staff keep these realities in mind.

Second, good team relations require adequate time to develop. Problems of credibility and status, fear of opening one's professional practices up to scholarly scrutiny, and threats to one's established reputation in the university or public school domain, all exercise their effects on the amount of collaboration that can take place. In dealing with this problem, there is no substitute for time in which to develop mutual feelings of trust and security.

Third, team members need to be willing to assume new roles. As far as most school people are concerned, a researcher, regardless of reputation, is an untested commodity in their world. And whether the view is correct or not, it seems to be a fact of the relationship that the university personnel must participate in some manner in classroom life; at some point they must be doers as well as talkers. On the other hand, the public school teacher has to become a seeker as well as dispenser of information. There has to be a willingness on the part of teachers to open their minds to new information, to feel a need for professional development and an

acceptance of the idea that professional growth need not be limited to course work on a college campus, but can be obtained in their own work with their own students.

Finally, the best start in collaboration is made through small steps that address concrete, immediate problems. The more successful and useful school projects undertaken during the year demonstrated that the work-study team's capability to do just this is one of its greatest strengths. Work on such small-scale projects facilitates the realization of two major purposes of the work-study team model: relating in-service education to needs that teachers have identified and to provide a direct means for university people to see real concerns of the schools and participate in classroom or field-based research. For example, the math teachers felt that students lost some of their math skills during summer vacation. Because of the perceived loss, teachers were devoting a large portion of instructional time during the early fall months to reteaching skills of the previous year. However, research data suggested that such apparent loss might be restricted to certain types of math achievement such as computation; that is, the data showed a decrease in certain types of math learning and not in others. Once alerted to information indicating that loss in math skills was more likely related to specific areas of math achievement, the teachers became concerned that they were spending more time on reteaching than was actually necessary--and losing instruction time for new math skills. With the assistance of university personnel, math measures were designed and administered during the spring and fall: results indicated that there indeed was much less loss of math skills over the summer than previously thought or anticipated. Teachers then requested that the tests be revised on the basis of the research. It may be, on the basis of the results of these revised tests, that vacation "loss" can be isolated to specific topics or levels of math achievement and that teachers may then revise the instructional program so as to spend less time on general reteaching. It is this kind of concrete issue or problem, which entails study and discussion of the details of classroom life, that should be the focus of work-study team dialogue and problem solving.

Limitations of the Work-Study Team as a Model for Collaborative Problem Solving

Some of the limitations of the work-study team as a collaborative model have already been suggested. First, the team requires a long period of time to develop adequate working relationships, trust, and credibility. Teams are not likely to succeed if ventured into as relationships of a month or two in duration. Second, teams are not all alike; their capacity for handling competing, conflicting goals and for planning and carrying out plans seems to be a function of the blend of personalities within the team. Third, as a means of staff development, teams so far seem best suited to addressing the obvious needs of school staff and have a limited capability for stimulating recognition of unperceived staff development needs. An indication of this seems to be the fact that the work-study teams had more success in the subject areas, dealing with concrete, academic problems, than they did in those areas dealing with problems of a more affective nature.

Limitations of a more practical nature include the work-study team's dependency on voluntary participation--which can lead to a changing, unstable membership and participation. Similarly, incentives for participation may not be strong enough if they are limited to the individual's desire for self-improvement and/or satisfaction with school. The physical distance between school and university and the differing schedules and work conditions of their personnel can influence the smooth functioning of the teams. Finally, a way has not yet been found to prevent easy disruptions of team agenda by visitors or emergency administrative paperwork, both of which can quickly turn team sessions into departmental meetings.

Conclusions

The work-study team was introduced as a model for collaborative efforts toward school improvement, effective in-service education, and field-based research. How well has the model delivered? We have evaluated it in two steps--assessing how well the teams functioned and how much change they have made.

Some of the examples already cited indicate that the work-study teams functioned well--i.e. collaboratively. The open-space, mathematics, physical education, and language arts teams had consistent participation; a year-long productive existence; the commitment of their members; and success in choosing and attaining goals. For its part, the university staff had an opportunity to assess the practicality of ideas and theories and to participate in a complete process from development of an idea to its becoming a part of school practice.

The impact of the work-study teams in terms of change or improvement in participants, students, programs, community participation, and district personnel has been only partially evaluated. The first year has certainly led to the development of ideas and suggestions for new directions in educational programs, the nature of in-service programs, and the identification of some practical concerns for educational research. Many useful school projects were undertaken and completed, e.g., changes in the mathematics curriculum, development of open space procedures, more individualization of the physical education classes, and the use of team-teaching strategies in language arts. We do know that new instructional procedures (uses of curriculum, testing, use of evaluation and research, and use of classroom space and resources) have been adopted.

Plans for the second year include expanding evaluation of the work-study teams to include their impact on students (achievement, attitudes), teachers, university (pre-service and in-service programs), community (participation, satisfaction, knowledge of the school), and district (replication of the work-study team model, changes in curricula or instructional procedures).

While the work-study team model was not intended to be a substitute either for scholarship and basic research or for intensive long-term study and practice by teachers to develop their own professional competencies, it does seem to hold promise as a model for strengthening the ties between the school and the university. Our experiences suggest that we can anticipate a rich year ahead in the further development of this model and other models for school-university collaborative efforts.

Because we intended to introduce one promising model for collaboration, many specific details of the actual organization and implementation of the work-study teams in the school where we worked have been omitted. For those readers who may find the model appealing, we have drawn up a set of guidelines for developing a work-study team. These guidelines follow.

IS A WORK-STUDY TEAM FOR YOUR SCHOOL STAFF?

YOU should have a problem or cluster of problems shared by at least three people working in the same school. If you, your colleagues, the students, and the community are content and perceive no important problems, you don't need a work-study team.

THE problem should have the following characteristics:

- Be specific and concrete enough to be capable of solution. ("How to motivate kids," for example, is much too general; "how to keep the lowest third of the students in your reading classes engaged and learning" is about the right level of specificity.)

- Be beyond your current capacity to solve without assistance.

- Be of a reasonably practical nature, that is, capable of being solved or minimized.

- Be recognized as an important problem by those most directly affected.

- Be substantial enough to require at least a significant part of the school year to resolve. (Briefer efforts are not worth the trouble of developing the complex working relationships involved in a work-study team.)

- If solved, improve the education or the educational opportunities of the students in your school.

DO you or others involved think you already have a solution to the problem? If so, you may wish to organize a work-study team to deal with the problems of implementing your solution on a trial basis and evaluating your efforts.

CAN the problem be solved in any easier, less time-consuming, more direct, and less costly manner? In particular, can it be solved by:

- Hiring an expert as a short-term consultant to help you find a solution?

- Holding a series of planning or action meetings on the problem?

- Reading a book or article on how others have dealt with the problem?

- Enrolling in a course or undertaking some other kind of formal study?

ARE the necessary outside resources available to be incorporated into your work-study team? (If the nearest specialist on hearing problems is 200 miles away and too busy to work with you, a work-study team that needs this expertise is not viable.)

HOW DO YOU START A WORK-STUDY TEAM?

SPEAK informally with persons who will need to be a part of the team, present the problem as currently understood, demonstrate your interest and the interest of others in collaborating on a solution, and size up the degree of their enthusiasm.

IF this informal review shows widespread interest, identify 3 to 7 of the most interested, excited, committed people to serve on a work-study team planning and organization committee. (Don't exclude any really interested people, but don't seek out hesitant or lukewarm supporters at this stage.) Let each member of this committee accept responsibility for leadership, initiative, and effort in their own defined areas of responsibility. For example, one person might interview possible university collaborators; another might talk with the principal and appropriate members of the central office staff; another might work on budget and sources of funds, etc. Do not take the next steps without reasonable confidence that you will be supported.

DRAFT a tentative agenda for the work-study team, emphasizing its tentative nature; encourage others to add to it.

- List the major tasks.
- Put these tasks on a time line to indicate the extent of sustained effort called for.
- List "What's in it for _____." (List teachers, students, university professors, community volunteers--all whom you expect to serve on the work-study team and all whom you expect to be directly affected by it.)
- List "What it will take from _____." (List teachers, etc., as before, so that everyone will see what kind and scale of effort is required and can judge whether he or she is willing to expend the energy.)
- Revise the agenda as necessary to get participation.

DETERMINE what sort of outside expertise you will need.

- Make appointments with nearby specialists from the central office, local universities, or other agencies. (Mail your preliminary documents in advance.)
- Discuss with them how to get the expertise you need. Are there books or papers you should read and study? Are there courses you should take? Are there experts you should consult regularly? Are they willing to consult with you from time to time?

GET clearance for the project and access to the resources you will need.

- Get clearance first from your principal. Request either released time to be made available to those most involved or extra pay for work after school hours. If you wish to donate your time, be sure to point out that you are making this investment and ask for help in getting the other resources you need to carry out your work.
- You will find the essential resources are usually small, at least in the beginning. Once you have a success to show for your low-budget efforts, you will be in a stronger position to seek funds elsewhere.

BECOMING AND REMAINING EFFECTIVE

ATTEND closely to vital details.

- Time--If key participants have trouble finding time to do what is required of them, consider this a most serious problem and address it directly. Do whatever is necessary to get the time you need. For example, you might schedule common preparation periods for members of the work-study team, revise school schedules to leave the last period free for work-study team business, or ask administrators or substitutes to cover classes for regular meetings.

- Money--If you truly cannot proceed with important parts of your work without more money, assign someone to seek funds. This person should seek out funding sources at the district, state, and federal levels and may need the help of a grants expert.

- Routines--Schedule regular meetings so you don't have to spend time at each meeting setting the date for the next.

  Prepare an agenda to focus attention; distribute copies before the meeting. Make the agenda short enough that all items can be discussed.

  Allow time on your agenda for periodically raising new, unscheduled matters, so the agenda doesn't wind up running you.

  Keep records of the actions you've taken and your progress or lack of it. A work-study team notebook in which all decisions are recorded seems to be more useful than minutes from every meeting.

  Establish team policy on matters that come up repeatedly.

DISTRIBUTE leadership responsibilities and assign them clearly. Specialize!

- If your work-study team has more than four members, consider electing a permanent chairperson or rotating chair responsibilities among members every month or quarter.

- Regardless of your decision to appoint a permanent or rotating chairperson, you will need several task leaders (e.g., someone to arrange for consultant selection and visits, another to negotiate with administrators, still another to order all materials needed for your efforts). Appointing task leaders helps distribute responsibility, saves time, and uses individuals' interests and talents to advantage.

- Once a task is assigned to an individual, set a date for completion and put a report from the task leader on your agenda.

DO what you can to maximize everyone's incentive to participate.

- In addition to the basic incentive of intrinsic satisfaction, college credits and/or district salary increments can frequently be arranged for ambitious projects.

QUIT when you've accomplished your objectives. If there is more business at hand, organize another team to go after it. The reshuffling will permit those who are tired to sit one out, will guard against staleness, and will encourage fresh, enthusiastic involvement.